



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/666,815 | 09/18/2003 | Yen-Fu Chen | AUS920030587US1 | 8941 |
| 45371 | 7590 | 12/11/2007 | EXAMINER | |
| IBM CORPORATION (RUS) c/o Rudolf O Siegesmund Gordon & Rees, LLP 2100 Ross Avenue Suite 2800 DALLAS, TX 75201 | | | NEWAY, SAMUEL G | |
| | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | 2626 | | |
| | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | 12/11/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/666,815 | CHEN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Samuel G. Neway | 2626 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5,7-12,14,15,18,20,22,23,26,27,29 and 31 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 15,18,20,22,23,26,27,29 and 31 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3,5,7-10,12 and 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 4 and 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is responsive to the RCE filed on 06 November 2007.
2. Claims 1 – 5, 7 – 12, 14 – 15, 18, 20, 22 – 23, 26 – 27, 29, and 31 are still pending.

Response to Amendment

3. The Claim Objections are withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments.
4. The 35 USC § 112 rejections are withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 5, 7 – 12, 14 – 15, 18, 20, 22 – 23, 26 – 27, 29, and 31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 5, 7 – 8, 12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker et al (USPN 7,177,793) in view of Admitted Prior Art.

Claim 1:

Barker discloses a method comprising:

acquiring an original software code in a source language (Fig. 1, item 130 and related text);

copying the original software code to create a copied software code (Fig. 1, item 135 and related text);

substituting a source language string literal in the copied software code with a label ("extracting translatable strings " col. 2, lines 41-46, "a unique identifier is assigned to each translatable string ", col. 2, lines 48),

creating a message file containing the source language string literal and its corresponding label ("identifier is included in the ... various translation files ", col. 2, lines 49-50);

using a translation data file to translate the source language string literal in the message file with a target language string literal, thereby creating a label file ("a particular translated string can be found in one of the translation files", col. 2, lines 50-52).

However, Barker does not explicitly disclose the software code being a database script and substituting the label in the code with the target language string literal in the label file.

The Admitted Prior Art discloses "extract translation" as a known method in the prior art for database translation wherein translated string literals are inserted back in a database script and producing a new translated database script.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute the label in Barker's method with a translated string liberal

Art Unit: 2626

producing a new translated database script as is well known in the prior art in order to provide national language support for databases.

Claim 5:

Barker discloses the method of claim 1, Barker further discloses running the database script to create a target language database (col. 2, lines 59-61).

Claim 7:

Barker discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the source language is English (col. 3, lines 1-4).

Claims 8, 12, and 14:

Claims 8, 12, and 14 are similar in scope and content to claims 1, 5 and 7 and are rejected with the same rationale.

8. Claims 2 – 3, 9 – 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker et al (USPN 7,177,793) in view of Admitted Prior Art and in further view of Heiny (USPN 5,778,356).

Claim 2:

Barker and Admitted Prior Art disclose the method of claim 1 but they do not explicitly disclose: adjusting the field width in the database script.

Heiny, in a similar method of displaying string in a plurality of languages, discloses adjusting the field width in the database script ("parts in the database may be repositioned within the schema hierarchy as well as being modified, added, and deleted", col.6, lines 53-55).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust the field width in order to correctly display strings in different languages. The width of a string is not necessarily the same as the width of its translated counterpart; therefore it is obvious to make the width adjustable in order to properly display the strings in different languages.

Claim 3:

Barker, Admitted Prior Art and Heiny disclose the method of claim 2, Heiny further discloses wherein the adjusting occurs without user intervention ("provide flexibility in allocating storage space for the character strings ... ", col.14, lines 61-65).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust the width automatically in Barker's method in order to speed up the process.

Claims 9 – 10:

Claims 9 – 10 are similar in scope and content to claims 2 – 3 and are rejected with the same rationale.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 4 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 15, 18, 20, 22 – 23, 26 – 27, 29, and 31 are allowed.

Art Unit: 2626

10. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record, individually or in combination does not disclose adjusting field widths as claimed in the allowable claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel G. Neway whose telephone number is 571-270-1058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30AM - 5:30PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David R Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SN

SN

DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600